

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in a condition for allowance in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 25-29 and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0055710 to Aoki et al. (hereinafter “Aoki”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,266,771 to Tow et al. (hereinafter “Tow”), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034868 to Fukuoka (hereinafter “Fukuoka”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0198088 to Subramoney et al. (hereinafter “Subramoney”).

Claim 15, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki.

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of Tow, Fukuoka, and Subramoney, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,293,280 to Gupta et al. (hereinafter “Gupta”).

Rejection to claims 1 and 8

Claim 1 and 8 are independent claims about a method and system for content recording of a personal video recorder, and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of Tow, Fukuoka and Subramoney. The applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 and the amendment is based on [0027] in the specification, which states that, when the system determines that the hard disk does not have enough available space for recording, the system may perform compaction on scene segments, i.e., the system moves scene segments into a signal contiguous block of memory and so as to create continuous free space. This function is not

mentioned in Akoi, Tow, Fukuoka, or Subramoney. Thus, the applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to specify the difference between cited references and claims 1 and 8, and this function not only automatically provides free *continuous* space for future use, but also further enhances the convenience of the user. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Rejection to claims 2-6, 9-13, and 29-33

Claims 2-6, 9-13, and 29-33 depend from claims 1 and 8, and applicant respectfully submits the traverse of this rejection regarding to the patentability of the independent claims 1 and 8.

Rejection to claims 15, 18 and 19

Claims 15, 18 and 19 have been canceled, and withdrawal of the rejection thereto is respectfully requested.

Rejection to claim 25

Claim 25 is an independent claim about a method for content recording of a personal video recorder, and was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of Tow, Fukuoka, and Subramoney. The applicant has amended claim 25 and the amendment is based on [0027] in the specification, which states that, when the system determines that the hard disk does not have enough available space for recording, the system may perform compaction on scene segments, i.e., the system moves scene segments into a signal contiguous block of memory and so as to create continuous free space. This function is not mentioned in Akoi, Tow, Fukuoka, or Subramoney. Thus, the applicant has amended claim 25 to specify the difference between cited reference and claim 25, and this function not only automatically provides free *continuous* space for future use, but also further enhances the convenience of the user. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Rejection to claims 26-28

Claims 26-28 depend from claim 25, and applicant respectfully submits the traverse of this rejection regarding to the patentability of the independent claim 25.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 10, 2010

/Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng, Reg. No. 58555

SHIMOKAJI & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
8911 Research Drive
Irvine, CA 92618